

10-10-1994

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 10, 1994

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1994 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 10, 1994" (1994). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 761.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/761

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

FACULTY SENATE
October 10, 1994
1481

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for Press Identification.
2. Comments from Provost's Office.

REPORTS

3. Roger Sell, Director, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching gave an update on the Center's activities.
4. Paul Butler-Nalin, Administrative Planning, and Peter Goulet, Chair, Strategic Planning Committee, gave a presentation on the strategic planning process.

DOCKET

5. 474 Request from Senator Leander Brown that the Senate Adopt a Resolution Urging More Bicycle Parking Facilities be Made Available for Bicycle Users. Primrose/De Nault moved/seconded to approve the resolution. Motion carried.

The Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room of Gilchrist Hall by Chairperson Gable.

Present: Edward Amend, Diane Baum, Leander Brown, John Butler, Phyllis Conklin, Kay Davis, Kenneth De Nault, Sherry Gable, Joel Haack, Clifford Highnam, Randall Krieg, Barbara Lounsberry, Katherine Martin, Dean Primrose, Merrie Schroeder, Katherine van Wormer, Surendar Yadava, John Longnecker, ex-officio.

Alternates: Ernest Raiklin/Mahmood Yousefi

Absent: Susan Grosboll

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. No Press were present.
2. Comments from Provost Marlin.

As follow up to a question raised at the last Senate meeting, Provost Marlin distributed data obtained from Registrar Phil Patton regarding the length of time to graduation by college and selected programs. (Appendix A) The first page of the handout contained information regarding the length of time to graduation for freshman entering fall, 1987. The program cohort group was determined (first semester major code equal to last semester major code) by students who declared their major in their first semester and then graduated in that same major. Cohorts with five or greater students were included. The difference in the percentage rate from 4 years or less to 5 years or less was noted. The second page reported graduation rates by college.

In response to a question from Schroeder, Provost Marlin responded that the years include all course work during that time, including summer sessions, transfer courses, and correspondence courses.

Provost Marlin stated that although all departments are involved in Student Outcomes Assessments, she is concerned that many faculty believe this process is only required by the Board of Regents. Provost Marlin indicated that Student Outcomes Assessments are increasingly required for accreditation, and that UNI must submit a report on our Student Outcomes

Assessment to North Central by next June to maintain our university accreditation. She stated that previously our assessments focused on undergraduates, but North Central requires assessment for all programs.

Provost Marlin indicated that she had suggested to Chair Gable that the Senate hold one of its meetings at the new Center for Energy and Environmental Education (CEEE) so that the Senators would have an opportunity to see the new building. Primrose questioned whether this would set a precedent for the Senate of meeting in other places as he would like to invite the Senate to the Lab School. Provost Marlin responded that allowing the Senate to meet and view other buildings could be beneficial. De Nault stated that there could be a problem in moving the Senate meetings since other individuals may not know where the meeting is going to be held. It was indicated that the minutes and agenda could make note in advance of the change of place and a note could also be placed outside of the Gilchrist Board Room indicating a change in location. Van Wormer moved, Baum seconded that the Faculty Senate meet in the CEEE later this fall. Motion carried.

REPORTS

3. Roger Sell, Director, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching gave an update on the Center's activities. Chair Gable indicated that prior to the meeting the Senators had received a lengthy report regarding the nature of the Center. (Entire report available under Notes/Senate.)

Sell indicated that his office is still located in Baker, but will be moving to the Library. Forty percent of UNI's tenure/tenure track faculty have participated in the in Center's activities during 93/94 but expressed concern about the other 60%. Sell wondered whether; (1) they were not interested, (2) whether the Center wasn't providing the right things, or (3) whether they were unaware of the Center's activities.

Sell invited the Senators to give comments or ask questions regarding the Center, and Senators should contact Sell with information on things which the Center could be doing. He informed the Senate that the purpose of the Center is more for faculty cooperation and professional development than for a faculty service center, and the Center has a symbolic function indicating that UNI cares about teaching.

Lounsberry commented that reaching 40% of the faculty is quite impressive. She felt that one way to reach the other 60% of the faculty is by sending them a survey to ascertain needs that the Center could meet. She also stated that word of mouth will help the program grow.

Sell indicated that the Wakonse Conference on College Teaching is a national conference which allows faculty to meet with other universities. For the past two years, participants have been nominated by the through the colleges.

Highnam expressed concern that the Center be viewed as a remedial operation, a place where poor teachers go. Sell responded that we are all interested in improving teaching, and he stressed the importance of continuing professional development for all faculty.

Lounsberry commented that she benefitted from the recent workshop in learning new techniques for discussion, and she gained a sense of pride in her colleagues by attending the workshop. She stated there was a huge group and there was collegiality.

Brown felt that 40% involvement is impressive and very positive. Sell responded that if faculty members see some benefit in the Center then maybe 40-50% is very good, but on the other hand, he is concerned about the other 300 faculty members who have had no contact with him.

Schroeder wondered whether changing the current name to "Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning" would be beneficial, feeling this would open up the outreach of the center.

Amend stated that some years ago his department held a workshop for humanities at which time they experienced collegiality. He wondered if the Center should target a particular faculty group for a conference in which a number of individuals could share. He further suggested that the Center needs a counselor aboard. He also warned of the danger of becoming a bureaucrat, and was hesitant regarding the Center's move to the library because of concerns of accessibility to faculty. He felt there also needs to be a sense of the Department Heads being in favor of the Center. Amend expressed that he was impressed with faculty orientation this fall and the wonderful way in which the new faculty were introduced.

Haack felt it worked best within the department and wondered if there was any support for departments who are trying to create workshops for faculty.

Sell commented that 1) the Center is considering ways in which to put on workshops and 2) the Center is willing to help identify funding sources which might be available for workshops. Peter Goulet commented that he sees the Center as a universal collaborator.

Sell indicated that he has two presidential scholars who help at the Center.

Gable thanked Sell for his presentation and commented that the Senate will place the questions submitted by Sell on the next Faculty Senate agenda.

4. Peter Goulet, Chair, Strategic Planning Committee, gave a presentation on the strategic planning process. He explained that the Committee has met once and is going through a process to revise the existing Strategic Plan. He stressed that he was not implying that the old plan was not good, but that some portions may be incorporated into the new plan. Goulet distributed to the Senators a letter which will be sent to the University Community this week that explains the purpose of the new Strategic Plan, asks for volunteers for task forces, and solicits input on issues related to the plan.

He explained that the first Strategic Planning Committee centered on academic issues with seven goals and subgoals. He further noted that the University has made significant progress to achieve those goals, and we are now looking at the plan in a broader sense by involving other programs. He stated that more than half of the committee members do not come from the colleges.

Goulet commented that there has been some concern that the current Strategic Plan is not closely related to allocations, and the new Committee will attempt to better coordinate the plan and attach it to resource allocation issues. He stated that the new plan would not have as many goals for the University and would take into consideration the feelings of the University as a whole and synthesize to communicate what the University wants to accomplish. He commented that the Committee would like all input by December 1 so that they can formulate the goals of the University at the Committee's one-day retreat in December. He remarked that the Committee will then compose a draft of the Strategic Plan for circulation and feedback at the department level.

Goulet informed the Senate that the Strategic Planning Committee is requesting volunteers to serve on task forces to get input for the

document. He requested that one Senator from each college alert the Deans that the University is in the process of revising the Strategic Plan, and that the College should get their Strategic Planning Committee together. Goulet commented that time was of the essence since the plan must be presented to the Board of Regents in the spring.

Amend stated that the amount of time invested in formulating a plan was frustrating and shocking. He noted that one of the problems with the planning process is the severe deadlines with so little time available to accomplish tasks. He also questioned the necessity of task forces when each college currently has a Strategic Plan.

Goulet explained that the Committee will be looking at the colleges' Strategic Plans and any other data to help draft the document. He also stated that maybe, in the future, the Committee could utilize a five-year process of designing a Strategic Plan and not do it with a deadline of one year.

Amend stated that there is a lack of trust in the process of strategic planning and some faculty have the perception that little will be accomplished. Goulet responded that the real planning should be in the department, and they should make their intentions known to the levels above. He further noted that the purpose of the task forces is to obtain as much input as possible.

Gable commented that the opportunity is there for faculty to give their input.

De Nault stated that there are emotional and psychological aspects that enter into the preparation of plans. There is a feeling that one must propose new programs. He commented that the Strategic Planning Committee must give time and effort to maintaining what is already in place and working well as well as developing new plans. Goulet agreed that there needs to be a balance of old and new.

Brown asked whether the old committee only focused on the academic side of planning. Goulet stated that was true. Brown further questioned since the plan will try to reach resources to particular initiatives, what is an example of how this will be done and the probability that it will work? Paul Butler-Nalin responded that the Committee will identify levels of funding and determine that "x" amount of money is needed, and then put into effect the appropriate strategy to determine the source. Butler-Nalin stated that it is more appropriate to have a combination of revenue sources, and it will be the University's responsibility to find those sources. He explained that the University cannot sit passively and needs to be more explicit in mapping out how the planned goals will be achieved. The University will need to get an overall sense of the direction.

Lounsberry verified that the timetable is for the Committee to finish its draft by January or February. This draft will be distributed widely and in March the Faculty Senate is to respond to the draft. She questioned when the plan must be submitted to the Board of Regents. Butler-Nalin stated that we need to be prepared to submit the plan to the Board in May.

Brown wondered, with the push for faculty access to computers, and the fact that technology is constantly changing, how the University will continue to provide maintenance and upgrades since this requires major resources. Butler-Nalin said these issues will be addressed in the Strategic Plan.

Gable thanked Goulet and Butler-Nalin for their presentation.

DOCKET

5. 474 Request from Senator Leander Brown that the Senate Adopt a Resolution Urging More Bicycle Parking Facilities be Made Available for Bicycle Users.

Brown explained that this resolution comes out of a concern from a faculty member, and that Vice President Conner's Office has addressed the issue with the Parking Advisory Committee. Bicycle racks have been ordered and will be put in the appropriate places on campus. Brown noted that he has seen bicycles chained to trees and railings near the Education Center, which impressed upon him that this was indeed a situation which needed to be resolved.

Carol Cooper, Chair of the Parking Advisory Committee, stated that Dean Shoars is the contact person regarding the bicycle racks.

De Nault expressed that he supports the resolution, but he would also like to see the Administration look further into the movement of bikes, skate boards, and roller skates across campus. He noted that bikers and skateboarders are traversing the new underpass under University Avenue at high rates of speed. Cooper replied that she will make the Parking Advisory Committee aware of his concerns.

Primrose noted that he is in favor of the resolution and that it is a pleasant problem to have, since it will help with ecology.

Primrose/De Nault moved/seconded to approve the resolution. Motion carried.

Chair Gable was charged with notifying the appropriate Administrative Official of the Senate's resolution.

There being no further business, Brown/De Nault moved/seconded that the meeting be adjourned. Motion carried; meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Uhlenhopp
Donna Uhlenhopp
Secretary

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the Secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, October 24, 1994.

APPENDIX A

LENGTH OF TIME TO GRADUATION
NEW FRESHMEN ENTERING FALL 1987*

	<u>4 years or less</u>	<u>5 years or less</u>	<u>Total Graduates</u> (as of summer, '94)
Accounting	<u>N</u> 58-68%	<u>N</u> 83-98%	85
Elementary Education	75-62%	119-98%	121
Communications	13-72%	18-100%	18
Music	3-30%	8-80%	10
Art	4-44%	8-89%	9
English	9-69%	12-92%	13
Math	1-14%	5-71%	7
Computer Science	7-70%	10-100%	10
Psychology	16-73%	22-100%	22
Political Science	8-67%	11-92%	12
History	2-40%	5-100%	5
Sociology/Anthropology	4-44%	8-89%	9
TOTALS	200-62%	309-96%	321

* Cohort group is determined by 1st semester major code equal to last semester major code. Groups with less than five have been excluded.

Office of the Registrar
University of Northern Iowa
September 1994

APPENDIX A

NEW FRESHMEN GRADUATION RATES BY COLLEGE*

Fall 1985	<u>Total</u>	<u>4 years</u>	<u>Cumulative Graduation</u> <u>5 years</u>	<u>6 years</u>
CBA	642	179-28%	334-52%	370-58%
COE	257	123-48%	152-59%	163-63%
CHFA	225	64-28%	106-47%	115-51%
CNS	185	60-32%	91-49%	100-54%
CSBS	186	73-39%	97-52%	104-56%
Other	488	99-20%	190-39%	210-43%
TOTAL	1983	598-30%	970-49%	1062-54%

Fall 1986	<u>Total</u>	<u>4 years</u>	<u>Cumulative Graduation</u> <u>5 years</u>	<u>6 years</u>
CBA	703	234-33%	419-60%	439-62%
COE	252	83-33%	162-64%	168-67%
CHFA	207	52-25%	115-56%	121-58%
CNS	184	58-32%	109-59%	114-62%
CSBS	163	52-32%	80-49%	89-55%
Other	438	82-19%	177-40%	199-45%
TOTAL	1947	561-29%	1062-55%	1100-56%

Fall 1987	<u>Total</u>	<u>4 years</u>	<u>Cumulative Graduation</u> <u>5 years</u>	<u>6 years</u>
CBA	592	207-35%	360-61%	379-64%
COE	245	100-41%	165-67%	169-69%
CHFA	231	70-30%	121-52%	135-58%
CNS	171	39-23%	91-53%	100-58%
CSBS	199	57-29%	105-53%	115-58%
Other	362	69-19%	156-43%	164-45%
TOTAL	1800	542-30%	998-55%	1062-59%

* Freshmen cohort group is determined by first semester major.

Office of the Registrar
University of Northern Iowa
September 1994